

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, 13 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 11-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harvey (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,285, hereinafter “Harvey”) and claims 5 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a signal generator coupled to a signal line at a first end ... [and] at least one receiving device coupled to the signal line at a second end, the second end opposite the first end, wherein the at least one receiving device comprises a clock generator” The Final Office Action identifies block 150 of Harvey Figure 38 as the signal generator, and identifies block 148 both as the claimed receiving device, and as the claimed clock generator. (Final Office Action, page 2). Harvey, however, does not teach or suggest these limitations. Figure 38 of Harvey clearly shows that block 148 is coupled to the same end of signal line 52 as block 150. Therefore the limitations of “a signal generator coupled to a signal line at a first end” and a “receiving device electrically coupled to the signal line at a second end” cannot be met. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by the prior art of record.

Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite “transmitting a signal from a signal generator device coupled to a signal line at a first end to at least one receiving device coupled to the signal

line at a second end in an electronic system, the second end opposite the first end” As is discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 1, Harvey does not teach or suggest the limitations of “a signal generator device coupled to a first end of a signal line” and a “receiving device electrically coupled to a second end of the signal line.” Harvey, therefore, cannot teach or suggest “a signal generator device coupled to a signal line at a first end” and a “receiving device coupled to the signal line at a second end.” Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 16 is not anticipated by the prior art of record.

Claims 17-19 depend from claim 16 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicant' agent at the number listed below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

June 6, 2008  
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Benjamin E. Nise  
Benjamin E. Nise  
Agent for Applicant  
Reg. No. 55,500